

Imperialism *and* The Mandates System

by
HUNTINGTON GILCHRIST
*Assistant Director, Mandates Section,
League of Nations Secretariat*

Published for
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS
NON-PARTISAN ASSOCIATION, Inc.
6 East 39th Street, New York
By the MARGARET C. PEABODY Fund

This paper was presented by Mr. Gilchrist before a meeting of the Geneva Institute of International Relations, held in the Glass Room of the Secretariat of the League of Nations on August 11, 1927, under the chairmanship of the Hon. Theodore Marburg.

Mr. Gilchrist is a native of Boston, Mass. He has received degrees from Williams College, Harvard University and Columbia University. He is a well known author and lecturer on international questions. From 1913 to 1914 he was an instructor in the Anglo-Chinese College at Foochow, China, and the following year he did research work for the Chinese and Japanese governments. During the World War Mr. Gilchrist served as private, lieutenant and captain in the United States Army. At one time he was attached to the General Staff Headquarters in Washington, D. C., and later to the General Staff Headquarters, S.O.S., A.E.F. In 1919 he became personal assistant to Raymond B. Fosdick, who was then Under-Secretary General of the League of Nations. Mr. Gilchrist is now Assistant Director of the Mandates Section of the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

IMPERIALISM AND THE MANDATES SYSTEM

By HUNTINGTON GILCHRIST

Assistant Director, Mandates Section,
League of Nations Secretariat

AS I read history, the mandates system was created very largely as the result of a reaction against "imperialism," a reaction which was given added force by the idealism that was born of the war. It was a reaction against those features of that imperialism which, particularly during the forty years preceding the war, had resulted in a terrific struggle for exclusive national rights by the great Powers in the backward regions of the world. That struggle for exclusive economic control and political domination meant that nine-tenths of the African continent was appropriated by one or other of the European Powers in the forty years from 1875 onwards.

Although to many the word "imperialism" may have an objectionable sound, as meaning the exclusive exploitation of raw materials for the benefit of certain countries alone and the right to impose preferential tariffs in the

interests of the occupying Power rather than the natives, there is another aspect of it which we must not lose sight of. Besides such features as these which have been branded as objectionable in many quarters, there were, of course, civilizing influences which accompanied the extension of European political power. Law and order was established. That meant the end of inter-tribal fighting and gradually resulted in the break-up of the slave trade. The firmer establishment of European rule aided the extension of missionary work and the beginnings of western education, sanitation and public health work. It seems fair to say that the mandates system was formed to conserve the beneficial effects of the imperialist movement and to do away with its objectionable features, or at least to minimize some of them, for the mandates system was, of course, a compromise between idealists and imperialists, and was not the result of a complete victory by the former. Before attempting, however, to analyze this mandates system to see to what extent it has attained the objects sought by its founders, I should perhaps briefly outline it and show how it operates.

The Operation of the System

The mandated territories are those fourteen different areas

which formerly belonged to Germany in the Pacific and in Africa, or comprised the former Arab Provinces of Turkey in the Near East. The mandates were allotted, not by the League of Nations but by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, to certain of the countries which were on the Allied side during the war—Belgium, Great Britain, France, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and Japan. These Powers are called the Mandatory Powers and they govern under a general responsibility to the League of Nations and in accordance with a definite mandate or conventional arrangement prescribing the way in which the territory is to be administered.

In Equatorial Africa, Tanganyika Territory (formerly German East Africa) was allotted mainly to Great Britain, a small corner in the northwest going to Belgium. The main part of the former German Cameroons went to France, with a little strip to Great Britain. Togoland was divided between Great Britain and France. These are known as "B" Mandates.

South West Africa and the islands in the Pacific formerly belonging to Germany are "C" Mandates. South - West Africa was assigned to the Union of South Africa. Samoa went to New Zealand and New Guinea to Australia; the little island of Nauru went to the British Em-

pire, and all the former German islands north of the equator—700 of them in all, many of them uninhabited—went to Japan. As to the “A” Mandates, Syria was allotted to France and Palestine to Great Britain, while Iraq has by a special treaty arrangement with Great Britain, which has been sanctioned by the League, been already recognized as to a large extent self-governing, although it remains subject to the guidance of British advisers on important matters as well as to League supervision.

These fourteen different territories are governed in accordance with a definite “mandate” or charter laid down separately in the case of each territory, all the mandates in each category, however, being similar one to the other. The “A” and “B” mandates provide, *inter alia*, for equal treatment for the commerce of all nations Members of the League, and the “B” and “C” categories contain a series of stipulations to protect the natives, among other things, against slavery, the liquor traffic and the use of forced labor, except for essential public works and services and then only in return for adequate remuneration.

A third group of provisions found in all the mandates, and perhaps they are the most important of all, stipulate that each mandatory power must submit annually to the League a report on

the way in which the administration of each territory has been conducted during the previous year. In accordance with the Covenant these annual reports are sent for examination to the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League.

The Permanent Mandates Commission is composed of ten* colonial experts, acting as individuals not as government representatives, and of whom only four are nationals of States which have mandates. It includes a formidable group of colonial administrators who have continuously elected as their chairman, the Marquis Theodoli, formerly Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in Italy. Among its members, for instance, are Sir Frederick Lugard, former Governor of Nigeria and later Governor-General of Hong Kong, and M. Martial Merlin, former Governor-General of several of the largest French colonies in Africa and the Far East. Other members are Professor Rappard, Rector of the University of Geneva, who, though not having had direct colonial experience himself, was Director of the Mandates Section of the Secretariat for the first four years; and Madame Wicksell, of Sweden, who takes particular interest in questions con-

* Increased to eleven by the addition in September, 1927, of a member of German nationality who is Dr. Ludwig Kastl, formerly Treasurer of South West Africa and now Director of the National Federation of German Industries.

cerning the education and social welfare of the natives. Mr. Van Rees, from the Netherlands, a former high official in the Dutch East Indies, is also on the Commission, together with General Freire d'Andrade, perhaps the most distinguished of Portuguese colonial authorities, M. Orts of Belgium, who has had long experience in official and business circles connected with African affairs, M. Palacios, Professor of Law and Political Economy at the University of Madrid, and M. Yamanaka, formerly in the Japanese diplomatic service. Professor Rappard was succeeded as secretary of the Commission by M. Catastini, who had held important positions in the Ministry of the Colonies in Italy. The Commission sits twice a year, each session lasting two or three weeks. It does not simply take the annual reports of the Mandatory Powers as printed and discuss them privately; it examines them in the presence of a representative of the Mandatory Power, who is sent to give such additional information as may be required. For instance, during the last session the Commission questioned Sir Donald Cameron, the Governor of Tanganyika, in order to gain a more definite insight into the principles and views of the administrator on the spot with regard to the way in which the largest of the African mandated territories is being gov-

erned. This cross-examination of the accredited representative of the Mandatory Power is set forth in full in the minutes of the Permanent Mandates Commission, which give almost a verbatim account of the proceedings and which are available for students who may wish to examine in detail the work done to carry out the provisions of Article 22 of the Covenant in so far as the Commission is concerned.

When that examination is over and the representative of the Mandatory Power has withdrawn, the Commission discusses its conclusions with regard to the administration of the territory in question and draws up a report which is sent to the Council of the League, the accredited representative being given an opportunity to comment on it. The Report on the Work of the Eleventh Session of the Commission—the latest—was released to the press a few days ago, and I will have occasion in a moment to refer by way of illustration to certain interesting passages which it contains. This Report will go before the Council for consideration when it meets in September next. The Council normally passes on the observations made by the Commission to the Mandatory Powers concerned, asking them to take the requisite action to fulfil the recommendations or suggestions made by the Commission or to

explain why it may not be considered possible to do so.

The work of the League with regard to the execution of Article 22 does not end, however, with this formal routine action on the part of the Council or with the replies eventually made by the Mandatory Powers. The Assembly each year discusses in its political committee—the Sixth Committee—the work done during the year by the Mandatory Powers, the Council and the Permanent Mandates Commission to carry out Article 22, and so the whole question is put before that forum of public opinion which the Assembly constitutes.

“Sovereignty” Replaced by “Trusteeship”

This, in brief, is the mandate system, and it may now be interesting to see how, both in theory and in practice, it affects those features of the old imperialism against which objections had been raised. One of the so-called evils of imperialism was the insistence of the great Powers in securing full sovereignty, exclusive political rights, in the different territories under their control. That led to a great deal of diplomatic intrigue between the various capitals of Europe and this sometimes involved danger of war. When a Power possesses exclusive sovereignty over a territory there is al-

most inevitably a great risk that in the last resort any decision with regard to the administration of that territory must depend on the interests of the Power in question rather than on those of the native inhabitants of the territory.

Under the mandates system has the situation been changed? Exclusive sovereign rights have certainly been replaced by trusteeship, a system under which the final decision on any problem concerning the administration of these territories should be determined by the interests of the natives rather than by those of the Governing Power. It is occasionally said, however, that while on the surface there may be a difference, in that the word trusteeship replaces the word sovereignty, this is simply camouflage, and that as a matter of fact these mandated territories have been practically annexed by the great European Powers, and that there is only a formal difference between the new system and the old. On that point I would refer you to the report of the recent session of the Commission.

One of the most interesting questions which arose at that time, and which had also been dealt with at the previous session, was with regard to the question of sovereignty in so far as it affects the territory of South-West Africa, which is under the mandate of the Union of South Africa.

The Union of South Africa, about a year ago, negotiated a treaty with Portugal, which governs Angola, the territory just north of South West Africa, to settle finally the frontier between the two territories. In the preamble to that treaty it was stated that under the mandate the Government of the Union of South Africa, subject to the terms of the mandate, possessed sovereignty over the territory of South West Africa, lately under the sovereignty of Germany. This phrase came to the attention of the Permanent Mandates Commission and they expressed doubt at their session last November as to whether this was the proper way to define the relationship between a Mandatory Power and the territory under its mandate.

As the Council when considering the report of the Commission in March refrained from expressing any opinion on this matter, the Government of the Union of South Africa replied that it did not feel that it should make any statement on the point either. At its last meeting, however, the Commission thought it necessary again to bring the matter to the attention of the Council in view of its fundamental importance, and also because the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa, in a speech made subsequently in the Union Parliament, upheld the text used in this Treaty.

The Commission concluded by expressing the hope that the Government (of the Union of South Africa) "will be so good as to explain whether, in its view, the term 'possesses sovereignty' expresses only the right to exercise full powers of administration and legislation in the Territory of South West Africa under the terms of the mandate and subject to its provisions and to those of Article 22 of the Covenant, or whether it implies that the Government of the Union regards itself as being sovereign over the territory itself."

Here is a definite test case with regard to this important point, and although the question is still in process of solution it shows very clearly that the Permanent Mandates Commission considers the difference between the legal status of colonies and mandated territories to be definite and real.*

In the same connection it may be interesting to give another illustration. In the case of certain mandated territories, for instance

* On September 8th, 1927, the Council adopted unanimously, representatives of all the Mandatory Powers being present, a significant report which pointed out that the Covenant itself, other articles of the Treaty of Versailles, the mandates, and a series of decisions by the Council on such fundamental points as the national status of the inhabitants of mandated territories (who are not nationals of the Mandatory Power), the legal position of the former German State Domain in the territories (which can only be held by the Mandatory Powers in their capacity as such) had already solved this question so far as the substance was concerned, and that any difficulties still existing must be of form only, perhaps due to the use of time-honored terminology which was not appropriate to conditions new to international law.

French Togoland and New Guinea, former German government land in the territory was referred to in legislation as State land or Crown land. The Mandates Commission raised the question whether the Mandatory Powers considered that this public land was owned by them in their own right as sovereign powers or in their capacity as Mandatories, i.e., in trust for the natives, and the Mandatory Powers agreed that the second theory was the correct one. The Mandates Commission then suggested that as this was the case it would be as well to change the text of the legislation so that in law as well as in its interpretation the situation would be perfectly clear.

The following quotation from the last report of the Mandates Commission tells the end of the story in the case of French Togoland: "The Commission notes with satisfaction that the Mandatory Power, by a Decree of March 13th, 1926, substituted the phrase 'domaine du territoire du Togo' for that of 'domaine de l'Etat,' thus conforming with the principles of the mandate." Similar changes in legislation have been made by the Australian Government to abolish the term "Crown land" for public land in New Guinea and to substitute the phrase "land of the territory."

No National Privileges in Trade and Commerce

The second point which it is of interest to mention by way of illustrating the effect of the mandates system on the objections raised against imperialism is with regard to the preferential tariff system which was imposed, at least in many colonial areas, by the Powers in order to provide a surer market for their surplus manufactured goods. I have already alluded to the fact that except in the case of the "C" Mandates an open door in the sense of equal economic opportunity is provided for; the mandates require, for instance, that there shall be no discrimination which will make it more difficult for American, Danish or Bulgarian goods to enter the Cameroons or Togoland in West Africa than for British or French goods.

How has that worked in practice? So well, that the Mandates Commission has had practically no occasion to call attention even to a possible violation of this stipulation. In one or two cases there have been legislative texts which did not appear to be absolutely in conformity with this principle, but the Mandatory Power was able to explain that in each case the principle was in fact being observed, or that the practice would be made to conform at once to this requirement.

But although this is the case, the Mandates Commission pays scrupulous attention to any action taken by the Mandatory Powers which may affect important principles of this kind, as the following extract from the last report of the Commission on French Togoland well illustrates: "The Commission notes that refunds of customs duties, insurance, wharfage, etc., have been made to two French companies." (That looked like a special privilege for French business.) "The accredited representative explained to the satisfaction of the Commission that these are not purely commercial undertakings, but companies engaged in experiments of public importance."

The Protection of the Native Against the Dangers of Industrialization

A third reproach often levelled against imperialism is that it has brought about the too rapid industrialization of native life. Natives are, it is said, made to work in the mines to their physical detriment; industries are built up for the enrichment of the Whites at the expense of the Blacks in Africa. How has the mandates system dealt with that problem?

As has already been stated, all the "B" and "C" mandates provide definite regulations against the use of forced labor except for

essential public works and services, and then only when adequately paid. It was realized from the beginning that this phase of the work of the Commission was one of the most important and difficult, and one which was bound to grow as time went on. When the Commission was constituted, therefore, it was provided that there should sit on it a representative of the International Labor Office as an expert on labor questions, and in consequence it has had the benefit of the collaboration of Mr. H. A. Grimshaw, of the Labor Office, for several years.

If you look through the reports of the Commission to the Council you will find that from the very start, and more particularly in recent years, there is no other subject dealt with so frequently and fully as labor — not only forced labor but conditions of labor in general. An endeavor is made to see that everything possible is done to prevent there being any justification in the charge that industrialization is being pressed too rapidly in mandated territories. I do not mean to imply that there are no abuses in mandated territories, but I wish to call attention to the special efforts made by the Mandates Commission to deal with this particular problem.

Take, for instance, a few lines from the Report of the Commission on the administration of the

French Cameroons for 1925: ". . . the Commission will follow with interest the application of the measures which it is proposed to take to improve the sanitary conditions among the laborers working on the construction of the central railway. . . ." and the following concerning French Togoland for the same year: ". . . the Commission notes with satisfaction the declaration of the accredited representative, that the Administration has no intention of requisitioning labor for the construction, during the next three years, of the 90 kilometres of railroad from Agbonou to Agbandi," and also in the following year such comment as this with reference to Tanganyika: ". . . the Commission also notes that the Governor is arranging gradually to replace portage by motor-transport."

You will find many other paragraphs dealing with the labor problem throughout this report, in particular among the observations on the little island of Nauru. There the Commission raises the question as to whether the British Government might not be able to provide more adequate compensation for the Chinese workers imported to dig phosphate who are declared medically unfit for further work and are repatriated to China.

The Commission has, however,

not confined itself to dealing with separate concrete cases which may have come to its attention, but at its 6th Session discussed at some length the general question of the necessity of maintaining a just proportion between the rate at which the economic equipment and development of the mandated territories should be proceeded with, and the amount of work which might reasonably be required from the native population. In consequence of this discussion, the Commission inserted in the list of questions drafted for the use of the Mandated Powers in preparing their annual reports, the following far-reaching and important question:

“Does the local supply of labor, in quantity, physical powers of resistance and aptitude for industrial and agricultural work conducted on modern lines appear to indicate that it is adequate, as far as can be foreseen, for the economic development of the territory?

“Or does the Government consider it possible that sooner or later a proper care for the preservation and development of the native races may make it necessary to restrict for a time the establishment of new enterprises or the extension of existing enterprises and to spread over

a longer term of years the execution of such large public works as are not of immediate and urgent necessity?"

This is perhaps the best indication which can be given of the thorough and far-seeing character of the work done by the Commission on this important subject.

International Inquiry into Charges of Mal-Administration

The fourth point which I think it would be interesting to deal with in this connection concerns the charge made against imperialism of arbitrary and abusive treatment of the natives by officials of the Administration itself. We remember what was said about the Congo in the early days before it had come under the control of the Belgian Government and was still under the personal jurisdiction of the King of the Belgians. Although the "B" and "C" Mandates do not deal in any detailed way with this particular problem, they do stipulate that the Mandatory Power shall promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants, and Article 22 of the Covenant lays down as the cardinal principle of the whole system that the well-being and development of those peoples who are not yet able to stand by themselves under the

strenuous conditions of the modern world shall form a sacred trust of civilization.

We have had two outstanding cases where abusive and arbitrary treatment of natives in mandated territories has been alleged. The first case was that of the so-called Bondelzwarts rebellion in South West Africa in 1922, where machine guns had been used by the police and military forces of the Union of South Africa against unarmed natives who had objected to paying certain new taxes. The delegate from the Union at the next Assembly announced that his government had decided to make a special inquiry on the spot, the delegate from Haiti insisted on the importance of the matter, and the Assembly itself pointed out the necessity of proper action in the way of inquiry and relief.

The report of the special Commission of Inquiry was laid before the Mandates Commission by the Administrator of the territory who had been sent all the way to Geneva by the Mandatory Power. The Commission went in great detail into the whole situation, expressed their views quite frankly on the action of the agents of the Mandatory Power and paid considerable attention to the steps which had been taken to alleviate the situation of those natives who had suffered.

The other case, which is doubt-

less more familiar to you, is that of Syria. That is a most instructive story from the point of view of the operation of the mandates system. You will remember that the people called the Druses were never fully conquered even under the Turkish regime and were dissatisfied with the way in which they were treated by some of the higher French officials early in 1925. They started a rebellion and were fortunate enough to overcome the first French force sent against them. The rebellion thereupon spread to Damascus, the seat of the Arab national movement in Syria, where the Arabs had never been very friendly to the French administration. The rebellion started in July, and when the Mandates Commission met in Geneva in October it was not clear exactly how serious the situation was, but it was evident that the Mandates Commission would have to deal in an especially thorough manner with the whole problem. The French Government submitted a report for the year 1924, but the rebellion was taking place in 1925. The Commission therefore considered it could not spend its time examining a routine report for the previous year at a time when a revolution was taking place in the country concerned. They therefore asked the French representative whether his Government would supply a report on recent

events at the earliest possible moment. The French representative replied that he was sure his Government would be glad to do so, and the Commission therefore arranged to hold an extraordinary session four months later, in February, 1926, in order to examine this special report on the situation in Syria.

When the special report came in conditions had improved but little, if at all. The French Government sent their accredited representative, M. de Caix, a former Acting High Commissioner in Syria, to lay the report before the Commission and give supplementary information. The Commission met in Rome and devoted three weeks to Syria alone although as a rule it would examine the reports on seven or eight different territories in that time. M. de Caix was questioned for two weeks, morning and afternoon, and the Commission went thoroughly into all phases of the administration of the territory and into the causes of and possible remedies for the rebellion there.

The Commission's report to the Council was then drawn up. It was a highly critical document, as might have been expected, but no one considered that this was an unfriendly act toward France, for it was recognized that the Commission was simply fulfilling its duty, and in this connection it is important to remember that no-

where had there been more criticism of French administration in Syria than in the French Parliament itself, and that the report was adopted unanimously by the Commission on which a member of French nationality was sitting. At the same time the Commission set forth in detail their reasons for recognizing that the difficulties facing the French administration in Syria were very great. The population, particularly on account of religious divisions, presented a highly involved problem and once the rebellion had broken out it was realized that there were sound excuses for the taking of forcible measures. The report also made certain suggestions and recommendations as to the action which might be taken to improve the situation. It came before the Council in March, 1926, and M. Paul-Boncour, representing the French Government on the Council, immediately said in the most sportsmanlike way that he accepted the report.

This document, like other reports of the Commission, contained certain requests for further information from the Mandatory Power, and when the Commission met again in November last it had before it another and final report on the situation in Syria in 1926, containing almost all the supplementary information asked for and satisfactory explanations on many points raised the previous

F e b r u a r y . On this occasion, moreover, it received lengthy reports of special, independent commissioners who had been sent out by the French Government, in accordance with an announcement made at the Rome meeting of the Commission, to inquire into the allegations against the Syrian administration which were contained in the large number of petitions received by the Commission from the committee in Cairo, Egypt, which stated the case for the revolutionary element in Syria.

The Commission found both then at this November meeting and during their conversations with M. de Caix this year that many of the recommendations made by the Commission in February, 1926, had already been carried out by the Mandatory Power. It appeared, for instance, that much of the trouble in Syria was due to the fact that the local currency had been linked to the French franc and had therefore depreciated, causing many economic difficulties. The Commission suggested that it might be well to introduce a more stable currency, and one which would make it easier to build up autonomy in financial and monetary matters. By November, 1926, the accredited representative of the French Government was able to announce that his Government had taken definite steps in that

direction by establishing the budgets for 1927 on a gold basis.

The Commission also stressed the necessity so far as subordinate French officials were concerned of following the mandate somewhat more strictly in the sense of showing the Arab population how to conduct their own government, rather than of imposing on them direct administration by French officials. The reports from the French Government since that time show that there has been a definite movement in the direction of allowing the Arabs not only to administer the country themselves but to work out for themselves the whole constitutional basis for the future administration of the territory. That is very definitely brought out in the last report of the Commission to the Council, where it is said: "The Commission. . . . notes that the framing of the Organic Law has been delayed in order that the Syrian and Lebanese authorities may themselves have an opportunity to work out the constitutional organization of the country."

Positive Achievements in the Interests of Native Welfare

In addition to what may be called the negative work of the mandates system, the way in which it has tended to obviate the objectionable features of imperialism, there is also its positive side,

and in this respect it has been useful in working out problems in a way which the framers of the Covenant perhaps did not fully contemplate. The evolution of the mandates system is comparable to that of the League itself. The Covenant deals mainly with negative work, work for the prevention of war and to obviate the evils of the past, but the bulk of the work of the League today is not in that field; it is positive work of international co-operation in social, health, economic, financial and transit matters. So also in the operation of the mandates system we find that it acts not only as a check to imperialistic tendencies but as a positive force to improve conditions in the interests of the natives. In almost every report of the Commission, for instance, there are several observations concerning public health; and the Commission displays great interest in problems of native administration and the economic welfare of the inhabitants. A detailed examination on public finance always takes place, to see whether the budgets of the territory are in proper condition and whether its finances are being administered by the Mandatory Power in the interests of the territory. A great deal of attention is paid to the civilizing work done by missions and to the educational opportunities offered to the natives, as well as to the guarantees

given to them so that they may not be deprived of their land.

I would like to give a few illustrations of what has been done in this field. For instance, in the budget of the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate in East Africa, in 1924 there is a heading "Extension of the Medical Service at the request of the Permanent Mandates Commission, salaries for doctors, etc. 300,000 francs." That is a direct recognition by the Mandatory Power of a recommendation made the preceding year by the Mandates Commission concerning the lack of sufficient public health facilities in that small but densely-populated territory.

On the question of public finance, the following extract from the report adopted by the Commission on the administration of Western Samoa for 1925-6 is typical: "The Commission would appreciate such data concerning the wealth and cost of living of the average native as would enable it to form a considered opinion on the burden of taxation imposed on him." Similar evidence of the positive work of the Commission in seeing that the burden of taxation is properly shared by the white and colored populations will be found in its latest observations on Tanganyika.

In this connection one of the most interesting records of the whole work of the Commission is

contained in the report on its Tenth Session when for the first time the administration of Iraq was examined and at which the policy followed by the British Government was set forth by its accredited representative as follows: "Iraq government for the Iraqi and by the Iraqi, helped by small numbers of British advisers and inspectors." The Commission says: "This statement made by the accredited representative* could not but make a favorable impression on the Commission."

Some Conclusions

I have tried to bring out the negative work of the Commission in preventing the recurrence of some of the objectionable features of imperialism, and also its positive work in stimulating the Mandatory Powers to adopt the highest possible standards in carrying out the provision of the mandates to the effect that they shall promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and social progress of the inhabitants. I have sketched very briefly the procedure of international supervision exercised by the League of Nations especially through the Mandates Commission. None of us who are intimately familiar with the operation of the system would contend that it is perfect.

* Which is not quoted in full in this paper.

A great many proposals for its revision have been made, officially and unofficially. It has been suggested, for instance, that petitioners whose written complaints are now received by the Commission might be allowed to appear and give oral evidence, also that a more rigid list of questions than those contained in the Questionnaires of 1921 might be used by the Mandatory Powers in order that the information given to the League each year might be more complete, and again that it might be well for the Mandates Commission to visit mandated territories to secure for themselves a more intimate knowledge of conditions in the different territories. Some of these proposals have already been rejected by the competent League authorities, and whether any of them will be accepted, and to what extent the mandates system will have to be altered in the future, it is impossible to say. The fact that these points are coming up, however, shows that the situation is still in the pioneering stage and has not become irretrievably bureaucratic and iron-clad.

Although there may be objections to certain aspects of the system as it stands today, it does seem to me there is general agreement on the value of certain of its features. In the first place, I think it is true to say that the mandates system has definitely

countered the principal objections raised against imperialism and is a safeguard against the abuses which sometimes accompanied the exploitation of backward areas during the last half of the Nineteenth century. It may be asked, however, why if that is true the great Powers still want mandates or are willing to accept mandate responsibility.

I wonder whether this desire for mandates means that certain of the old features of imperialism—the right to impose preferential tariffs, to the exclusive exploitation of raw materials, to unlimited sovereignty and the right to use backward areas as an outlet for surplus population—are of practically no value after all, and that, therefore, the imposition of the mandates system has not proved so detrimental to the national interests of the Trustee Powers as is commonly supposed. This is a larger problem than we can attempt to discuss today but a very fascinating one indeed, and I would refer those interested in it to “Imperialism and World Politics” by Prof. Parker T. Moon of Columbia University.

In the second place the mandates system through the very full reports published annually by the Mandatory Powers (which may be contrasted with the non-existence or with the briefer or more irregular appearance of reports on colonies and protectorates), and

the Minutes of the Mandates Commission, is constantly making more and more knowledge available concerning the conditions of life among native peoples, and the problems attendant upon the administration of the districts they inhabit.

Thirdly, the mandates system has set up a definite and high standard of colonial administration which will almost inevitably be used as a standard by which to judge all other efforts to govern so-called backward areas. The mere setting up of such a standard is a great step in advance. In addition the mandates system provides a method of checking, limiting and remedying abuses which might not be so effectively dealt with otherwise. It also does positive work by encouraging Mandatory Powers to the highest achievement by giving them an opportunity, through the Mandates Commission, the Council and the Assembly, to let the world know what they have done in the interests of the natives, in public health work, education and the building up of self-government in these territories.

Fourthly, the mandates system constitutes in the broad sense a court of appeal for the natives and those interested in their welfare in other parts of the world against the administrative authority itself; fifthly, it affords a certain amount of protection to the Man-

datory Powers against unjust criticism of their administration, and thus helps to strengthen their position by giving them the support of an impartial board of inquiry, and finally, it places the Powers who have accepted as trustees the duty of guiding the evolution of more primitive peoples in a position of responsibility to the nations of the world as a whole, and at the same time insures for them the collaboration of the forces at the disposal of the League.

These are six points which occur to me as illustrating in the abstract some of the advantages of the mandates system. Perhaps the situation would be even clearer if we were to think for a moment in the concrete. Compare, for instance, Portuguese Africa, with its preferential tariffs, with French Cameroons, where they are prohibited and where the door for trade and commerce is open on equal terms to all nations; or the situation in Syria and the very rigid examination of the administration of that area while the insurrection was in progress with the situation in the Philippines, where at times the American authorities have been under fire for their practices and their methods, and where it would be impossible for the administration of the territory or for the authorities in Washington, who are responsible, to be in any way subject to supervision by an international board of

experts such as the Mandates Commission of the League. I believe that if we look in some such way not only at the theoretical but at the practical differences between the government of mandated and non-mandated territories we will have a clear picture of what the mandates system really is.

This pamphlet contains material of value and inspiration to all who are interested in international relations today. When you have finished reading it, pass it along to a friend, with the request that the recipient do likewise.

